

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000698

A. CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER
Int.Cl.⁷ G06F15/00

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
Int.Cl.⁷ G06F15/00, G06F12/14, G06K17/00, H04L9/32Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched
Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1922-1996 Jitsuyo Shinan Toroku Koho 1996-2004
Kokai Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1971-2004 Toroku Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1994-2004Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search terms used)
CSDB (Japanese Patent Office)

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
Y	MIYAKE et al., "Contents Haishin Mobile Commerce-Yo no Secure Multimedia Card", Hitachi Hyoron, Hitachi Hyoronsha, 01 October, 2001 (01.10.01), 2001 Nen 10 Gatsu special extra issue, pages 9 to 14	1-21
Y	Mitsurai Chiba, "Internet ni Okeru Personal Network no Kochiku", Information Processing Society of Japan Kenkyu Hokoku, Information Processing Society of Japan, 27 July, 2001 (27.07.01), Vol.2001, No.78, (2001-0S-88), pages 83 to 90	8
Y	JP 2003-108385 A (Toshiba Corp.), 11 April, 2003 (11.04.03), Full text; Figs. 1 to 5 (Family: none)	11-21

☒ Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C.☐ See patent family annex.

* Special categories of cited documents:

- "A" document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance
- "E" earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date
- "L" document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)
- "O" document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
- "P" document published prior to the international filing date but later than the priority date claimed

"T" later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention

"X" document of particular relevance: the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

"Y" document of particular relevance: the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is combined with one or more other such documents, such combination being obvious to a person skilled in the art

"&" document member of the same patent family

Date of the actual completion of the international search
23 March, 2005 (23.03.05)Date of mailing of the international search report
05 April, 2005 (05.04.05)Name and mailing address of the ISA/
Japanese Patent Office

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000698

C (Continuation). DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No.
A	JP 2002-158650 A (Fujitsu Ltd.), 31 May, 2002 (31.05.02), Full text; Figs. 1 to 28 & US 2002-62440 A1 & EP 01209874 A	1-21
A	JP 2003-337749 A (Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.), 28 November, 2003 (28.11.03), Full text; Figs. 1 to 7 & WO 03077083 A2 & US 2003-182569 A1	1-21

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000698

Box No. II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of item 2 of first sheet)

This international search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) for the following reasons:

1. ☐ Claims Nos.:
because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely:
2. ☐ Claims Nos.:
because they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribed requirements to such an extent that no meaningful international search can be carried out, specifically:
3. ☐ Claims Nos.:
because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third sentences of Rule 6.4(a).

Box No. III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first sheet)

This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as follows:
(See extra sheet)

1. ☒ As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers all searchable claims.
2. ☐ As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, this Authority did not invite payment of any additional fee.
3. ☐ As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search report covers only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:
4. ☐ No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this international search report is restricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.:

Remark on Protest

- ☐ The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's protest.
- ☒ No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.

INTERNATIONAL SEARCH REPORT

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/000698

Continuation of Box No.III of continuation of first sheet(2)

The matter common to the inventions of claims 1-21 only relates to that a client device accesses a server via a network. Since such a client & server system is a known technique. Accordingly, the matter common to the inventions of claims 1-21 is not novel.

Furthermore, the matter common to the inventions of claims 1-9 and 11-21 relate to a storage medium including a remote operation application for operating the server at a distance, an encryption application program for encrypting the communication on network, authentication information stored in the tamper-proof storage area for remote operation of the server, and middleware. However, the search has revealed that such a storage medium is a known technique as is disclosed in the documents given below.

Document 1: Miyake et al. "Contents Haishin Mobile Commerce-Yo no Secure Multimedia Card", Hitachi Ronpyo Sha, 01 October, 2001 (01.10.01), special number of October, 2001, pp. 9-14

Document 2: JP2002-229861A (Hitachi Ltd.), 16 August, 2002 (16.08.02), whole text, all the pages (family none)

As a result, the aforementioned common matter makes no contribution over the prior art and cannot be a special technical feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2, second sentence.

Accordingly, there exists no novel matter common to the inventions of claims 1-9 and 11-21.

The inventions of claims 1-9 are technically characterized in that a client device loads middleware from a storage medium and executes it, thereby performing file access and authentication. The invention of claim 10 is technically characterized in that file access and authentication are performed by operating the interface and the driver installed in the client device not having the configuration associated with the storage medium. The inventions of claims 11-21 are technically characterized in that the storage medium contains a boot program which is executed by BIOS owned by the client device and upon power ON, the client device executes the boot program in the storage medium and acquires and executes an OS program, i.e., an operation which has substantially no relation to the security is performed. Between these three groups of inventions, there exists no other common feature which can be considered as a special technical feature within the meaning of PCT Rule 13.2, second sentence. Accordingly, no technical relationship within the meaning of PCT Rule 13 between the different inventions can be seen.

Consequently, it is obvious that the inventions of claims 1-9, the invention of claim 10, and the inventions of claims 11-21 do not satisfy the requirement of unity of invention.